

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present Application. Claims 14 – 29 and 31 - 56 are pending in the present application. Claims 14, 32, 40, 54, 55, and 56 are independent claims. By this response, claims 54, 55, and 56 are added.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 – Hilford and Brooks

Claims 14, 18, 21, 24 – 29, 32 – 35, 37, 40 – 42, 46, 49, and 50 - 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,354,405 to Svensson-Hilford (“Hilford”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,898,299 to Brooks (“Brooks”). Insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14

Independent claim 14 pertains to a method of repaying investment costs associated with an elevator installation, the method comprising, in pertinent part, reading an elevator user’s personal data from an access device that is used to identify and charge a user for travel on the elevator system, “wherein said access device further allows said passenger to access and pay for travel on other means of transport.” The Office Action admits that Hilford does not teach or suggest this claim limitation and instead relies on Brooks for this teaching.

Brooks Has No Concept of a Universal Payment Device

Brooks is directed purely towards biometric authentication solutions. Insofar as Brooks discusses the possibility of accessing or paying for multiple modes of transportation, Brooks discusses a different access device and biometric measurement method for each transportation type. Brooks suggests a turnstile-type hand-print reader for subway access, a user-carried, electrode-bearing stored value card for bus access, and a windshield-mounted in-car acoustic thumb reader for making payments at a toll booth. (Brooks at Col. 37, line 66 – Col. 38, line 53). Brooks therefore teaches the possibility of using biometric data to access a wide range of transportation options, but has no teaching or suggestion of a singular access device “wherein said access device further allows said passenger to access and pay for travel on other means of

transport” as required by independent claim 14.

Summary

Applicant therefore submits that even Brooks is deficient in its teaching because it fails to teach or suggest any concept of a single access device that allows its user to pay for multiple modes of transportation. Applicant therefore submits that the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to independent claim 14.

Claims 32 and 40

Claims 32 and 40 pertain, respectively, to an elevator access device and an elevator system including an access device, both claims requiring, in pertinent part, that “said access device allows said passenger to access and pay for travel on other means of transport.”

Applicant respectfully submits that this limitation is similar to that discussed with respect to independent claim 14 and that Brooks is therefore deficient in its teaching with respect to independent claims 32 and 40 for at least the same reasons set forth with respect to independent claim 14. Specifically, Brooks has no concept or suggestion of a single payment device suitable for use with multiple transportation modes / services. Applicant therefore submits that the Office Action fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of independent claims 32 and 40 for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 14.

Dependent Claims

With respect to claims 18, 21, 24 – 29, 33 – 35, 37, 41, 42, 46, 49, and 50, Applicant submits these claims are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claims 14, 32, and 40. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Summary

At least in view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action admits Hilford as being deficient with respect to independent claims 14, 32, and 40. Applicant

therefore submits that, because Brooks is conceptually deficient in its teachings with respect to a singular access device that enables payment for multiple transportation modes, the Office Action fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of independent claims 14, 32, and 40 and all claims depending therefrom. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 – Dependent Claims

Claims 15 – 17, 19, 20, 22 – 23, 36, 38, 39, 43 – 45, 47, and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilford and Brooks in view of Admitted Prior Art. Insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 – 17, 19, 20, 22 – 23, 36, 38, 39, 43 – 45, 47, and 48 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 14, 32, and 40. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 – Boesch

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilford and Brooks in view of U.S. Patent 6,205,433 to Boesch (“Boesch”). Insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 31 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 14. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 54, 55, and 56 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that, unlike in Hilford, they require that an elevator call is generated when a reader reads an access device. Hilford, by contrast, merely permits a user to operate an elevator call device after an access device is read. (Hilford at Col. 3, lines 36 – 43; Col 4, lines 6 – 27)

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Naphtali Matlis, Registration No. 61,592 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: August 4, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000